UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISS/ODNER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/584,735	06/26/2006	Mikio Oda	19993	8209
23389 7590 04/29/2009 SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC 400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA			EXAMINER	
			SHINGLETON, MICHAEL B	
SUITE 300 GARDEN CITY, NY 11530		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2815	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/29/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/584,735	ODA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Michael B. Shingleton	2815				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 						
Disposition of Claims						
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-5 and 7-26 is/are w 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 6 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	ithdrawn from consideration.					
Application Papers	Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some color None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite				

Application/Control Number: 10/584,735 Page 2

Art Unit: 2815

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant believes that claims 1-9 are generic and as stated in the previous restriction requirement that such is not the case as there are two types of devices ones that have unequal heights and one that has equal heights. There are no generic claim(s) that encompasses both cases and thus it is impossible for claims 1-9 to be generic. Also the elected invention is one that is directed toward purely a photodetecting arrangement and accordingly claims 1-5 and 7-9 can not possibly be considered generic as these claims also have a optical element (LED) connected to the output of the semiconductor circuit. The elected species has no optical element of any kind connected to the output of the semiconductor device ("1") and as such claims 1-5, 7-14 and 16 are directed to the non-elected invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wada US 6,703,689.

Wada discloses a common form of photo-detector wherein the photo-detector package is meant to contact the input of another semiconductor device through the solder bumps. It is well know to form an array of these elements so as to form an image or just to provide for multiple channel input in the case that the device is a communications device. Applicant says that the array is an "irregularity" arranged in which two photo-detecting elements would constitute an "irregularity" arranged arrangement.

As it is just so common place to select the number of elements to form an array based on either resolution desired or based on the fact concerning the number of channels present, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to made a two element array.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael B. Shingleton whose telephone number is (571) 272-1770.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ken Parker, can be reached on (571) 272-2298. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/584,735

Art Unit: 2815

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MBS April 15, 2009 /Michael B. Shingleton/ Michael B Shingleton Primary Examiner Group Art Unit 2815

nall Ballington

Page 3